No sooner had we welcomed the death of the Snoopers’ Charter, than the shocking PRISM and Tempora revelations emerged. Have those who failed to persuade in Parliament decided to smuggle blanket surveillance through the back door?
No sooner had we greeted the death of the Snoopers’ Charter – notable by its absence from May’s Queen’s Speech – opportunistic politicians used the shocking death of Drummer Lee Rigby to open the door to reviving plans for blanket surveillance. And at the time of writing leaked documents have revealed that the US and UK intelligence communities are tracking our online communications via secret programmes known as PRISM and Tempora. Have those who failed to make the case for the Snoopers’ Charter decided to smuggle blanket surveillance through the back door? Liberty has filed a claim against the British security services for their role in these programmes and we continue to campaign about similarly intrusive actions.

Elsewhere, we are honoured to include a guest feature from Paul Houston, father of Amy Houston. Amy was knocked down and killed by a disqualified driver in 2003. The driver was an Iraqi asylum-seeker and parts of the media were quick to use this tragic incident as an example of all that’s wrong with the Human Rights Act. As Paul explains (page 9), the truth is that his daughter’s death was used to hide administrative incompetence at the Home Office and feed an anti-human rights agenda – dishonouring Amy’s memory and undermining rights and freedoms for everyone.

Finally I would like to thank all of you who were able to attend the Liberty Members’ Conference and AGM in May – one of our best ever (page 11). This was in no small part due to the energy and enthusiasm of everyone there. It was an invigorating reminder of Liberty values and will inspire us long into the year ahead.

Shami Chakrabarti Director of Liberty

Three people have been found guilty of the serious abuse of a domestic worker. The victim, who cannot be named for legal reasons, came to the UK on a domestic worker visa in 2005 and was subjected to several years of terrifying cruelty and violence in three different households. Having sought help from the police on a number of occasions, she eventually managed to escape to safety in 2008.

It wasn’t until 2010, after Liberty took on the case, that a full investigation into trafficking and forced labour commenced. In April 2013 a jury at Croydon Crown Court found three of the victim’s so-called employers guilty of offences including assault, threats to kill and rape.

Corinna Ferguson, Liberty Legal Officer, said, “Our client has been through a terrible ordeal and is pleased that her abusers have finally been brought to justice. It is extraordinary to think that, despite the seriousness of these offences, this trial may not have taken place at all had Liberty not reminded the police of their obligations towards victims under the Human Rights Act. We still have some concerns about their past failure to protect our client and these are the subject of separate civil proceedings.”

Anne Williams, a leading campaigner in the fight for Hillsborough justice and founder of Hope for Hillsborough, died in April after being diagnosed with cancer in October.

Anne lost her son Kevin in the 1989 disaster and never accepted the police’s assertion that he had been dead by the 3.15pm cut off point. She spent over two decades calling for a proper and full inquest into his death and the deaths of others like him.

Anne’s tireless work was instrumental in bringing about what was a watershed year for the justice campaign. Last September the Hillsborough Independent Panel published their report, confirming what bereaved families, campaigners and dedicated journalists had been saying for over twenty years: Liverpool fans were in no way to blame and many lives could have been saved if the emergency services’ response had been better.
Twenty years ago, Stephen Lawrence was murdered by a gang of racists in London. The resulting police investigation was tainted by incompetence and institutionalised racism, and the best part of two decades passed before any of the killers were brought to justice. The Metropolitan Police has vowed to catch and prosecute the others involved in Stephen’s murder.

At the forefront of the fight for change was Doreen Lawrence, Stephen’s mother. Doreen somehow converted the heartache and injustice of her son’s death into a campaign that transformed the conscience of a country.

But 20 years on, and more than a decade after the Macpherson Inquiry into the police’s handling of Stephen’s killing, concerns over the police’s approach towards racist crime remain. Despite the repeal of section 44 of the Terrorism Act, the use of stop and search under Section 60 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act remains and is applied in similarly discriminatory fashion – with statistics showing you were far more likely to be stopped and searched if you were Black or Asian. Meanwhile earlier this year the Home Affairs Select Committee delivered a damning indictment of the Independent Police Complaints Commission. Its report exposed an overwhelmed, misfiring body that’s completely lost the public’s confidence – not least amongst minority communities, whose members are disproportionately represented in cases of death and serious injury in custody.

Progress has been made since Macpherson, but such ongoing concerns demonstrate there’s some way to go in challenging racism and its tragic consequences. Two decades after Stephen’s shocking death, proper accountability and a truly independent police watchdog with bite are surely the least Doreen and her family deserve.

Liberty has responded to both the press and politicians’ proposals for press regulation, criticising the Royal Charter mechanism chosen by both for implementation - a vehicle more closely tied to Government than any Act of Parliament. A Royal Charter is constitutionally inappropriate, undemocratic, opaque and in no way fit for this purpose.

The Leveson Report contained a welcome blueprint of the properties and functions of an effective self-regulator and there is apparent agreement between the press, politicians and the report about the basic structure of such a scheme. However in almost six months since it was published there has been no headway in the establishment of new press self-regulation bodies.

Shami Chakrabarti, director of Liberty, said, “Six months on and still no sign of any real progress – and current squabbling over bizarre Royal Charters has achieved nothing but confusion and resentment. The Leveson Report contained an effective blueprint for a decent self-regulator so why hasn’t it been set up? Victims and ethical journalists need protection and the public needs confidence restored – every day politicians and press barons prevaricate is another letting everyone down”

The approach taken in both Royal Charters is both overly prescriptive and inflexible.
In April we witnessed a dark moment for British justice as Government plans for Secret Courts became a reality with the passing of the Justice and Security Act in all of its foul, shadowy glory. We now move towards a world where Ministers will be able to rely upon secret intelligence – never disclosed to the claimant, let alone public or press – during cosy private chats with judges behind closed doors.

Yet we mustn’t forget the mountain of outside opposition which the Government ignored in forcing the Bill through. More than 700 lawyers – including 40 QCs – signed Liberty’s petition against the Bill. The international community, the Scottish Government and much of the national press rejected the legislation, along with politicians of all political stripes.

Lib Dem members repeatedly voiced their opposition to Secret Courts and in March we saw several high profile Liberal Democrat members resign in protest against the party leadership’s support of the Justice & Security Bill.

Liberty members also fought the proposals determinedly for more than a year with over 1,600 of you emailing your MP.

That the Government failed to make the case for Secret Courts is beyond debate. There wasn’t a shred of evidence suggesting they were necessary; not a single previous case where the existing system for handling sensitive material had fallen short. Clearly the argument was won, but not quite the politics. Needless to say we’ll continue working hard on this – starting as soon as the Act is rolled out.

Access to justice and the right to a fair hearing are fundamental to the rule of law and to democracy itself. Needless to say we shall continue to fight these unfair and ill-conceived proposals.
The best thing about this year’s Queen’s Speech was what was missing from it – namely, the Snoopers’ Charter. After a year of committed lobbying on the draft Communications Data Bill, this was cause for celebration. Yet no sooner had we greeted this news, politicians used the heinous murder of Drummer Lee Rigby to open the door to its potential revival. Soon after came the shocking PRISM and Tempora revelations. It seems that those who failed to persuade in Parliament had been at it all along regardless. See more on this on page 6.

Elsewhere in the Queen’s Speech there was a nasty theme of double punishment for the vulnerable. A new generation of wrong-headed anti-social behaviour legislation has been churned out by the Home Office. New souped-up injunctions will be easier to obtain, harder to comply with and bring a roster of harsher penalties. Perhaps worst of all: mandatory eviction for entire families where a social tenant breaches one of the injunction’s terms. Innocent people – including children – will be punished for the behaviour of a loved one and homelessness will increase. Rather than demonstrating any genuine new thinking about a problem that blights the lives of many each year, the Government’s proposals look set to continue present public policy failings making it easier for individuals who have not acted criminally to be fast-tracked into custody disrupting the lives of whole families. It is difficult to see how policies like these will lead to less, rather than more, crime and anti-social behaviour in our communities.

Another year, another immigration Bill and this one looks set to respond to media myth and misinformation about the role of Article 8 in immigration cases. In truth, failures to remove foreign national offenders from the UK are frequently a result of Home Office delay and incompetence which it then seeks to mask by blaming the Human Rights Act. Liberty will continue to unpick the media myths about human rights in Parliament as the Government presses ahead with this unnecessary legislation. Government also proposes to place a duty on landlords to ensure tenants are here legally – effectively contracting out immigration control to private individuals and paving the way for racial discrimination. Reported plans to remove access to vital public services for non-nationals is dog-whistle politics at its worst.

The Marriage (Same Sex Couples) Bill has been carried over to this session and we have been cheering its passage through Parliament. Only one problem with the Bill remains – a clause that would allow employers and pension providers to discriminate against gay couples in the provision of survivor benefits. Put simply gay employees who have paid into their pensions in the same way as colleagues could receive a fraction of the benefits for their loved ones. The Government argues that equalising treatment would create unforeseen costs for pension schemes, but we believe that this is no justification for shameful discrimination. Labour tabled our suggested amendment at Committee Stage but ultimately withdrew it. A cross party group of MPs, led by Green MP Caroline Lucas, tabled an amendment at Committee but didn’t push to a vote. The House of Lords now have the opportunity to put right this injustice.

As for the end of the last parliamentary session - secret courts (without even minimal “safeguards”) slid on to the statute book in March. Labour tried to re-insert amendments to the Bill during parliamentary ping-pong but, in an embarrassing spectacle, Government managed to distract sufficient numbers of parliamentarians with a James Bond film. Lib Dem Peers rebelled but to no avail. More encouragingly, the Defamation Act received Royal Assent on 25th April 2013 providing long overdue protection for free speech and, following lobbying by Liberty, restrictions on the ability of commercial entities to chill criticism with defamation threats.
"My sole motive is to inform the public as to that which is done in their name and that which is done against them. [The National Security Agency] are intent on making every conversation and every form of behaviour in the world known to them. I don’t see myself as a hero, because what I’m doing is self-interested: I don’t want to live in a world where there’s no privacy and therefore no room for intellectual exploration and creativity. What they’re doing poses an existential threat to democracy”.

These are the brave words of Edward Snowden, a 29-year-old former CIA technical assistant and the whistle-blower responsible for revealing the secret US and UK Government programmes to monitor all online communications worldwide. Snowden’s principled and carefully selected leaks should trouble everyone who uses the internet or who believes in democracy, freedom and the Rule of Law. People live more and more of their lives online, and such information can help build an incredibly personal picture of you. Think about it – the content of your emails, Facebook posts; Twitter communications; websites visited – hovered up by the intelligence community all without public debate, parliamentary approval or legislative authority. The revelations be over-stated and suggest a breach of trust on the grandest scale with the US Government, internet companies and our own UK intelligence community showing contempt for privacy, legality and democracy itself.

"Snowden’s principled and carefully selected leaks should trouble everyone who uses the internet or who believes in democracy, freedom and the Rule of Law."

It was this kind of arrogance that lay behind the spooks lobbying for a home-grown Snoopers’ Charter. For more than a year, the shadow of the Draft Communications Data Bill hovered ominously over our personal privacy; threatening to infiltrate our homes and make online confidentiality a thing of the past. But it didn’t take long for the plans to unravel. Attacks came from all corners including Liberty, business, influential parliamentary committees, politicians of all stripes and technology experts who saw the Bill for the gross intrusion into our lives it was. Liberty members played a significant part, campaigning against the illiberal draft Bill; signing petitions and emailing their local MPs. It seemed the message got through and for this Parliament at least the plug had been pulled on the legislation.

Yet no sooner had we welcomed this news than a small band of politicians used the murder of Drummer Lee Rigby to open the door to reviving the Snoopers’ Charter. In no way does this tragedy demonstrate the need for such a Bill. If, as we believe, the suspected killers were already serious suspects, then their communication records – and even content of communications - could have been legitimately accessed in targeted fashion. As an MI5 source was quoted as saying in The Independent, no Snoopers’ Charter would have saved Drummer Rigby.

The surveillance debate has now taken an important and dramatic turn following Snowden’s shocking revelations of two secret programmes - PRISM and Tempora. It seems that those who failed to persuade in Parliament were at it all along – indulging in blanket interception via the backdoor, away from oversight and legal safeguards. There are two separate scandals here. First, that GCHQ officials have been routinely intercepting billions of emails and phone calls routed in and out of the UK; exploiting the modern transnational communications infrastructure in a manner previously unprecedented and unimagined. Second, it seems that UK authorities have also been outsourcing surveillance of UK residents to their US counterparts; using their intelligence sharing relationship to bypass domestic legal checks and balances to evade scrutiny altogether. This is made
possible because the US legal regime allows an effective free-for-all in the surveillance of non-US citizens. The chilling US Foreign Intelligence Service Act (as amended in 2008) treats all non-US citizens as possible enemy suspects, entitled to none of the basic privacy protections afforded to US nationals. Leaks suggest that under the auspices of this legislation, via the NSA PRISM programme, the US Government has the ability to directly access content held by the world’s biggest internet companies. Snowdon says “the NSA has built an infrastructure that allows it to intercept almost everything.” In defending criticism of PRISM President Obama has sought to rely on the fact that it targets non-US citizens and Congress has been apprised. It will be shaming indeed if our own Government has chosen to endorse this approach, and co-opted this abuse of power as its own.

On both counts, UK authorities seem to kid themselves with a fanciful interpretation of the law that will not withstand human rights challenge. Our Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 governs domestic surveillance (intercept, access to communications data etc) and requests made directly by UK law enforcement to communication service providers. But since inception it has never been wholly fit for purpose and advances in technology leave it woefully lacking. Repeated statements by the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary about the intelligence services operating “within the law” offers no clue as to whether the authorities have stretched its provisions out of all recognition or used the PRISM programme to entirely bypass domestic safeguards. So Liberty has filed a claim against the British Intelligence Services over their involvement in the scandal – arguing that it breaches the RIPA provisions and/or the Article 8 of the Human Rights Act. Pressure must now also be brought on Ministers and an intelligence community which seems increasingly out of control. Their actions must be explained and legislation urgently updated to protect hard-won freedoms.

The internet has been a powerful force for good, promoting free speech and assisting democratic movements across the globe but, as its creator Tim Berners-Lee has acknowledged, “unwarranted Government surveillance is an intrusion on basic human rights that threatens the very foundations of a democratic society”. If universal rights and freedoms are to be more than lofty ideals, they must be universally enforced. We are all foreigners somewhere but we are human beings everywhere. It is an affront to basic human dignity for the US to deny the rights of British citizens or any other non-US citizens online. By the same token it is offensive that our legislation shows casual disregard for interception of communications that are either destined for, or received, outside of the jurisdiction.

Authoritarian cheerleaders for PRISM and Tempora lack imagination and an understanding of its implications. They also misrepresent the issue, making simple claims about how the internet cannot be a wholly un-policed space. No-one is arguing for that. The choice is between targeted surveillance on the basis of individual suspicion of criminality and blanket surveillance of the world population to serve broad – including political – ends of Governments and their allies. There is no such thing as absolute privacy, nor absolute security but basic principles of legality, proportionality and judicial and parliamentary accountability should govern the use of intrusive surveillance. As things stand, both the UK and the US appear to have ripped up that rule book.
‘Bedroom tax’, ‘spare room subsidy’ or ‘under-occupancy’ – whatever you choose to call it, the Government’s scheme to cut social tenants’ Housing Benefit if it is decided they have a ‘spare’ room in their home has certainly had its share of headlines over the past few months.

Under the new “size criteria”, which came into force on the 1st April this year, tenants with one spare bedroom have had a payment reduction of 14% and those deemed to have two or more spare, a reduction of 25%. It doesn’t matter if you and your partner sleep apart because of medical reasons, your home has been designed especially for you to accommodate a disability or your children only live with you some of the time. All will suffer the same sanction. Liberty has now brought a judicial review based on the impact on separated families with shared custody of children – on the grounds that the scheme is irrational and a violation of Articles 8 and 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights; the right to a private and family life and no discrimination.

Our clients are all parents whose families will suffer because of the bedroom tax. Simon Cohen’s 12-year old son lives with him four days a week in his two-bedroom house. Under the scheme his son will not be considered part of the household, so Mr Cohen will see his Housing Benefit cut by 14%. Unable to afford the shortfall, he will either be forced to move into a one-bedroom property, where he cannot properly accommodate his son, or be placed in extreme hardship which could result in his inability to afford his rent.

Mark Hutchinson’s seven-year-old daughter and eight-year-old stepson live with him every weekend and during school holidays. With what will be considered two ‘spare’ rooms in his three-bedroom house, his Housing Benefit will be slashed by 25%.

As Mr Hutchinson’s only income is Employment and Support Allowance of £71 a week, he will either have to move into a one-bedroom property, unsuitable for his children, or he will be unable to pay his rent and could become homeless if evicted.

Following divorce proceedings, custody of Kim Cotton’s eleven-year-old daughter and eight-year-old son was split equally between her and her ex-husband. But only one of the children is counted for the purposes of the size criteria so her Housing Benefit will also be cut by 14%. Again she will either be forced to move into a two-bedroom property, and be unable to provide proper accommodation for her children, or she will fall behind on her rent and suffer the grim consequences of doing so.

How can these loving parents - who are striving to make their situations work for the benefit of their children - be accused of ‘under-occupying’ their properties or having ‘spare bedrooms’? Their properties were allocated to them because they were in need and it makes no sense to take that security away now. These rooms are very much their childrens’ and home to many of their belongings.

This bedroom tax could destroy thousands of similar arrangements for shared care of children, at enormous social cost. The Government cannot claim to be prioritising families while it is penalising people merely for having children. It must rethink this damaging and unfair policy.
I am the father of Amy Houston.

My only child, she was kind, thoughtful with a strong sense of justice. She loved animals and wanted to be a vet when she grew up. I know that Amy would have become a smart, beautiful young woman who would have made us very proud.

On 24th November 2003, Amy went to the shops to buy some sweets. As she crossed the road she was knocked down by a car and killed. The driver, who shouldn’t have been driving (he’d been disqualified twice before), fled the scene – later handing himself in. The only criminal charges brought were driving without a license, without insurance and fleeing the scene. He was sentenced to four months in prison - I think he served just two.

What hit the headlines was the driver’s nationality. He came here from Iraq in 2001 but his application for asylum was refused - by the end of 2002 he had exhausted his appeal rights. However by then the war in Iraq had escalated and the government’s policy was not to send people back there. So although he had no right to remain in Britain, his removal wouldn’t be enforced until Iraq was more stable. Once it was, the Home Office had two options – remove the driver along with other administrative removals, or deport him based on his criminality. They should have tried to deport him. This would have allowed the Home Office to place his continual offending at the heart of his case. It would have meant he could never return. If this had happened the public would have been protected from his re-offending and fleeing the scene. He was sentenced to four months in prison - I think he served just two.
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Legal rights are reduced to mere ideals if people have no means of redress when they are breached. This makes effective access to justice a basic necessity for any system of human rights. But, worryingly, it’s been a terrible few months for access to justice in the UK.

In April, savage cuts to our civil legal aid system bit, putting publicly funded legal advice and representation beyond the reach of vast swathes of the British population. Legal aid is no longer available for many partners embroiled in bitter child custody disputes, disabled people grappling with changes to the benefits system and families struggling with debt in the worst recession in decades. Thousands of people have been left with no alternative to do-it-yourself justice - just one of the reasons that the cuts are sure to prove a false economy in the long run.

The next round of attacks followed soon after. On top of yet more cuts to civil services, plans for the reform of criminal legal aid will see private companies, which aren’t traditional law firms, bidding for legal aid contracts. Procurements will be on price alone, meaning providers will compete on cost not quality, and people will no longer have any choice over who represents them. This price-obsessed philosophy could hardly be less appropriate for sophisticated legal services. Standards will inevitably plummet and impossible burdens will be heaped upon already overworked practitioners. What happens in our criminal courts affects the lives of millions and these changes would undermine fair trials for defendants and vulnerable victims alike.

Access to justice means more than legal aid provision and the assault continues elsewhere too. Judicial review – the process through which the lawfulness of decisions and actions of public bodies can be challenged – has also come under fire. Judicial review is vital in allowing ordinary people to hold the State to account but again the Government has tried to spin basic fairness and due process protections as unnecessary and bureaucratic.

Finally, in a dark moment for British Justice, Government plans for ‘Secret Courts’ have passed, meaning that Closed Material Procedures are to be introduced into civil law. In these procedures the Government will be able to present secret evidence to the judge alone, unchallengeable by the claimant and never to be seen by the press or public.

Announced in the wake of high-profile litigation and media investigations which revealed the UK’s shameful involvement in extraordinary rendition, torture and indefinite detention without trial, this will curtail public scrutiny of the Government, our security services and public bodies. Clearly such procedures threaten claimants’ access to justice. But, more widely, they threaten democratic accountability and the rule of law, weighting the scales of a case in the Government’s favour and ensuring that evidence of their wrongdoing never sees the light of day.

This package of policies represents a sustained and powerful attack on access to justice. They risk leaving big business, Government and other members of the rich and powerful elite freer to act with impunity. We’ll be doing everything we can to ensure that this trend is halted in its tracks.
**FEATURE**

**MEMBERS**

Despite the grey rainy weather, a team of 11 Liberty members and supporters completed the 10k London Legal Walk took place in May, raising hundreds of pounds for the London Legal Support Trust and Liberty’s Advice and Information Service. The money will help fund crucial legal cases in areas like disability rights, debt, modern day slavery, workplace harassment and bullying, and homelessness – massively important work that deserves to be upheld in a time of swingeing legal aid cuts.

Over 7,500 walkers took part in total, with participants ranging from the judiciary to paralegals to solicitors and barristers, raising over £575,000 for legal advice services.

**LIBERTY MEMBERS’ CONFERENCE AND AGM**

The Liberty Members’ Conference and AGM took place on Saturday 18th May – one of our best ever. Joined by our members and special guests, the day of discussions ranged from saving the Human Rights Act to safeguarding free speech online. It kicked off with a panel discussion with Emily Thornberry MP, Simon Hughes MP, Dominic Grieve MP and our very own Director of Policy Isabella Sankey. They addressed issues of privacy, the long shadow cast by legal aid cuts and misinformation about the Human Rights Act.

Next came the business. The AGM is a chance for our members to directly influence policy for the year ahead. This year all three motions were passed unanimously: one reiterates our determination to fight the injustice of blacklisting; another outlines our intention to fight to protect our proud traditions of fair trials, equality and the rule of law; the last voices our resolve to continue campaigning for extradition reform and fight the further erosion of fundamental protections in this area.

After lunch we held a series of workshops in which we addressed the issue of ‘Human Rights in recession’, discussed whether speech was free online, explored issues with the military justice system and talked about the dangers of a ‘surveillance century’. These sessions were greatly enriched by guest speakers like Gus Hosein, the Executive Director of Privacy International, author and campaigner Cory Doctorow, journalist Ian Dunt and others. In a particularly moving session, Liberty clients Sharon Hardy and Khristina Swain described the terrible treatment their sister Anne Marie Ellement received while serving in the Royal Military Police, after she had complained of rape.

We were then treated to an inspiring and hilarious discussion between our Director and Liberty member Joanna Lumley. The actress spoke of her campaign for Ghurkha resettlement rights, describing her encounters with politicians with much humour and self-deprecation. She talked about the vital role of legal aid to their campaign and also voiced her strong commitment to helping us defend our Human Rights Act.

The day was rounded off with a keynote speech from our Director, Shami Chakrabarti. She reminded us that next year Liberty turns 80 and that the best present any of us could give was to galvanise those around us to join Liberty and be part of the fight to defend our precious rights and freedoms.

We were live tweeting throughout, which proved a massive success. Highlights of the day were retweeted by hundreds, extending the brilliant atmosphere at Senate House far into the Twittersphere.

Thank you to all those who made the day such a brilliant and invigorating reminder of Liberty values. The energy and enthusiasm of everyone there will inspire us long into the year ahead.

**LONDON LEGAL WALK**

Despite the grey rainy weather, a team of 11 Liberty members and supporters completed the 10k London Legal Walk took place in May, raising hundreds of pounds for the London Legal Support Trust and Liberty’s Advice and Information Service. The money will help fund crucial legal cases in areas like disability rights, debt, modern day slavery, workplace harassment and bullying, and homelessness – massively important work that deserves to be upheld in a time of swingeing legal aid cuts.

Over 7,500 walkers took part in total, with participants ranging from the judiciary to paralegals to solicitors and barristers, raising over £575,000 for legal advice services.
A year of Liberty membership could make the perfect present for someone with an interest in human rights - or could help start a life-long passion!

Our gift membership package costs £30. The recipient of your gift will get:

>> Membership of Liberty for 1 year

>> A personalised gift card featuring a message from you and signed by Liberty’s Director

>> A welcome pack including information about Liberty membership and a selection of Liberty campaign materials

>> Liberty’s quarterly newsletter

>> An invitation to Liberty’s AGM and other events

To arrange a gift membership please email membership@liberty-human-rights.org.uk, call Jenny on 020 7378 3663 or return the below form to: Freepost RSSU-UKGS-TEXY, Liberty, 26-30 Strutton Ground, London, SW1P 2HR

Your details:

Name
Address
Postcode
Telephone no
Email address

Gift recipient details:

Name
Address
Postcode
Telephone no
Email address

Pay for 1 year gift membership by card or cheque:

£30

Please debit my credit / debit card no.


Expiry Date  __/___ Valid From ___/___

Issue Number  ___ (Switch only)

Signature  

Date

Or please attach a cheque for the relevant amount made payable to “Liberty”.